

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Administration

STAT FROM:

[REDACTED]
Director of Information Services

SUBJECT: An Alternative Procedure for Reviewing Manuscripts
Written by Present and Former Agency Employees

1. Attached is a paper that proposes an alternative procedure for reviewing manuscripts written by present and former Agency employees. It was prompted by the Director's concern for the number of people involved in this type of review, and responds to that concern by proposing the designation of a centralized reviewing unit that would process the manuscripts. The unit would conduct its own review for clearance and coordinate, as appropriate, supplementary reviews with specific components. In some cases, such as with novels, poems, and TV scripts that do not reveal actual sensitive intelligence matters, review by the centralized unit may be all that is necessary. Where further review is indicated, the manuscript would be reviewed only by those Agency components directly involved with the substantive matter. Considerable savings in the manpower directed to this effort could thus be realized.

2. A major objection to this proposal may be concern by a directorate that its equities may not be identified or properly assessed by the centralized unit. One means to alleviate this concern would be to ask the four directorates to assign personnel to the central reviewing unit on a rotational basis.

STAT

Attachment:

Paper entitled "An Alternative
Procedure for Reviewing Manuscripts
Written by Present and Former Agency
Employees"

Distribution:

Orig - Addressee w/att
1 - OIS Subject w/att
1 - OIS Chrono w/o att
1 - CRD Publication Review & Procedures w/att
1 - CRD (1-4) w/att
1 - CRD (1-4) w/att

Approved For Release 2005/07/12 : CIA-RDP93B01194R001000030016-1

[REDACTED] bac (16 November 1981)

Retyped by jai

STAT

AN ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE FOR REVIEWING MANUSCRIPTS

WRITTEN BY PRESENT AND FORMER AGENCY EMPLOYEES

1. This paper examines one method of increasing efficiency in reviewing manuscripts written by present and former Agency employees. It is a procedure designed to provide reviews equally reliable to those accomplished under the current procedures but using less manpower by: (1) focusing the review effort proportionately to the seriousness and sensitivity of the material; and (2) involving only those Agency components that have equities to protect. This would be accomplished by creating a centralized review unit consisting of officers experienced in all four directorates. This group would complete review of the less sensitive manuscripts and coordinate, when necessary, with the appropriate directorates or independent offices on the more sensitive and complicated ones. The following paragraphs look at this proposition in terms of the way in which it might work, the advantages and disadvantages, and who might undertake it.

2. Briefly, the procedure might work as follows. Manuscripts from former Agency employees would be received in the Office of General Counsel (OGC) which would acknowledge receipt to the author. The manuscript then would go directly to the central reviewing unit. That unit would establish administrative controls and assign the manuscript to one or more reviewers within the unit. A full Agency review would be conducted by the unit, researching any points that were questionable. If no questions arose or if the questions that did arise could be resolved satisfactorily within the unit, the results of the review would be forwarded to OGC. The latter would conduct their review and would notify the author of the results. If questions arose that could not be resolved within the central review unit based either on the cumulative expertise or research material available, the central review unit would effect coordination with other Agency components that had equities involved. When this coordination was completed and all questions were resolved to the satisfaction or consensus of everyone involved, the central review unit would notify OGC of the results. OGC would review the final results and notify the author. The procedure currently in force that permits manuscripts written by current employees to be reviewed and passed upon by the directorate concerned would be continued.

3. In brief, centralized review of manuscripts would have the following advantages:

- a. Greater consistency in reviewing actions resulting from:
(1) involvement of fewer people; (2) materials being available to the reviewers to research questions; and (3) review experience developing at a faster rate because of the concentrated experience.

- b. Greater efficiency resulting from: (1) involvement of fewer persons and the directorates' having to review only those materials which involve their equities; (2) less coordination required; (3) the reviewers, as specialists, wasting less time; and (4) the availability of research materials and access to the DECAL data base, providing ready answers and saving time.
 - c. Better supported review decisions resulting from: (1) fuller knowledge and understanding of the review requirements and procedures; (2) greater expertise and professionalism developing from concentrated experience; and (3) researched decisions being more typical.
 - d. Improved capability to develop a data base of released information through: (1) concentration of expertise and experience; and (2) narrow responsibility allowing a focus of effort on the problems faced.
 - e. Improved recording of review actions, particularly if the record of these actions is to be computerized.
 - f. Continual improvement and enhancement of review procedures and techniques based on the concentrated and focused experience.
 - g. Provision of greater expertise to help the Agency find an answer to the problem of the constant flow of inside information to the public domain.
 - h. Elimination of confusion caused by the multiple reviews and sometimes overlapping equities of the four directorates.
4. Centralized review would have the following disadvantages:
- a. Breadth of expertise within the central unit would be limited to the experience and background of its staff.
 - b. The possibility of error could potentially be greater because fewer people would review each manuscript, and the background that would be brought directly to bear on substantive matters could be limited.
 - c. The interests of the directorates could be overlooked if coordination is not properly effected and certain areas of knowledge are limited or lacking in the central unit.

5. The Office of Information Services, DDA, already has such a unit: its Classification Review Division (CRD). CRD consists of officers from all four directorates who review documents under the Agency's systematic review program. In addition, they review documents selected for the Department of State's

Foreign Relations of the United States series, support the systematic review programs at other agencies that surface materials affecting Agency equities, and review manuscripts for DDA equities. CRD already is established and has the expertise in reviewing and coordinating procedures and techniques that are required by the centralized unit in our proposal. The channels and lines of communication with other directorates and components of the Agency are already well established. It would be an easy matter for CRD to assume the additional responsibility of reviewing from the Agency's standpoint the manuscripts of current and former Agency employees.

REVIEW PROCEDURE FOR MANUSCRIPTS WRITTEN BY

FORMER EMPLOYEES

1. The manuscript is received at OGC. OGC acknowledges the receipt to the author.
2. OGC forwards the manuscript to CRD. CRD records receipt of the manuscript, establishes the required controls, sets deadlines, attaches a Manuscript Review Worksheet, gets biographical data on the author, and makes two copies of the manuscript.
3. CRD management assigns the manuscript for review. Every manuscript will be reviewed by at least two reviewers. They will bracket in pencil any items considered classified and keep a log justifying each action taken.
4. When both reviewers have completed their reviews, they will compare results and arrive at a consensus if possible.
5. Reviewers sit down with management and gox over the results of the review to:
 - a. Check for consistency;
 - b. Resolve any conflicts or discrepancies;
 - c. Determine whether coordination is necessary outside of CRD and with whom;
 - d. Agree on the writeup of the results of the review.
6. Affect coordination. One of the reviewers will be tasked to do this or both if coordination with several other Agency elements is required.
7. When the coordination has been completed, the results will be factored into the review and a meeting held with management to check out the final determinations. The same procedure would be used if coordination with another U.S. government agency is required.
8. Review results will be ~~repx~~ prepared for presentation to the PRB. The material for this purpose will include:
 - a. A copy of the Manuscript Review Worksheet;
 - b. Copies of all pages that contain deletions;
 - c. Attachment of the log justifying deletion actions;
 - d. An attachment identifying all research done and its results;
 - e. Attachment detailing what coordination was done, with whom, and the results;
 - f. A recommended action for the PRB to consider;
 - g. Any comments that should be passed back to the requester.
9. Present the review results to the PRB. This will be handled by CRD management with participation of any reviewers as required. The PRB can decide:
 - a. To accept CRD's recommendation;
 - b. Ask CRD to do further research, affect additional coordination, or take other specified actions.
10. When the PRB agrees on a course of action, CRD will do the following:
 - a. Prepare the manuscript for return to the requester if deletions have been made. A copy also will be kept for our record along with a clean copy of the original manuscript and any work copies that contain notations or explanations significant enough to become part of the record.

11. CRD sends the package to OGC for the latter to make a legal review and then to communicate the review results to the requester. The package will contain:

- a. A copy of the completed Manuscript Review Worksheet;
- b. A copy of the original or sanitized version of the manuscript depending on the results of the review;
- c. Any comments ~~by~~ authored by or approved by the PRB for passage to the requester.

12. Similar packages as described in paragraph 10 above will be prepared and sent to the Directorates that had a major equity in the manuscript or where the Directorates' member on the PRB has requested it.

13. Maintain the Agency file on manuscript review requests.

14. Identify material that should be put into the data bank of information release status.

15. Make the input into the data bank.

15 Mar 82
Copies sent to:
C/CRD
INTEC
ADMIN

MANUSCRIPT REVIEW WORKSHEET

1. Name of Requester: 2. Date Received:
3. Title of Submission: 4. Nature of Submission:
m/s Outline Oral
Presenta
Autobio Novel
graphical
Other _____
5. Background on Requester:
6. Reviewers Assigned: 7. Date Assigned:
8. Coordination: 9. Dates:
10. Recommendation:
☒ Release because it contains no classified information.
☐ Release in sanitized form and releasable copy attached.
☐ Deny in toto.
11. Suggestions to the PRB:
12. PRB Action:
☐ Release. ☐ Further research necessary.
☐ Release in sanitized version. ☐ Additional coordination required.
☐ Deny in toto. ☐ Other _____
13. Date results sent to OGC: _____

Signature: _____
Chairman, PRB

Date: _____